




Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Issues and Options

Response Form

Please return by **5pm on Thursday 24 March 2016** to:
 Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council
 Civic Centre, Pavilion Road
 Nottingham. NG2 5FE
 Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI	Name	
Planning Director Barratt Homes North Midlands Division 2 Horizon Place Mellors Way Nottingham Business Park Nottingham NG8 6PY	Address	
	E-mail	

Housing Development

Housing Development at the Main Urban Area

Question 1: Do you agree with the Council's view that no other sites on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, please could you identify which site(s) on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from Green Belt and identified as suitable for development and why.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Housing sites within the Main Urban Area

Question 2: Which sites within West Bridgford should be allocated for housing development in the LAPP?

	Yes	No
Site WB1 – Abbey Road Depot (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB2 – Central College (potential capacity around 90 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB3 – South of Wilford Lane (potential capacity around 200 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB4 – land between Lady Bay Bridge and Radcliffe Road (potential capacity around 25 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At any other location (please specify which)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

Bingham

Question 3: Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Bingham in the plan period (up to 2028)?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Cotgrave

Question 4: Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave in the plan period (up to 2028)?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

Additional land fronting Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave should be allocated for residential development.

SHLAA Site Reference 43 is both suitable and available and does not lie in the statutory Green Belt. It would complement the housing scheme currently underway in the vicinity at Hollygate Park (former Cotgrave Colliery) and facilitate pedestrian connectivity to/from the centre of the settlement. In addition it could assist in meeting the Borough's approved (minimum) housing requirement, as specified in the Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy), December 2014, and contribute towards the 5 Years Housing Land Supply position across Rushcliffe.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

East Leake

Question 5: Do you agree that, apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission for housing development (as shown on Figure 3), further greenfield land should not be allocated for housing development at East Leake?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Keyworth

Question 6: Do you agree that the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan's proposals to allocate land north of Bunny Lane (site KEY A), land off Nicker Hill (site KEY B) and land off Platt Lane (site KEY C) (as shown on Figure 4) are appropriate in meeting the minimum target for 450 new homes at Keyworth over the plan period (up to 2028)?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

Concern is expressed over the selection of these proposed housing sites in the Draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

Insufficient regard has been given to Green Belt and other material planning considerations culminating in inappropriate locations being identified to meet the minimum housing requirement of 450 dwellings up to 2028. In terms of Green Belt Importance, all three proposed housing sites have been 'scored' numerically and 'ranked' through the Draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review, January 2016 with mixed outcomes : Site KEY C achieves a score of 17 and is considered to be of medium-high importance; Site KEY B is given a score of 14 and a low-medium ranking; Site KEY A is not scored as a single entity but rather assessed in 3 components reflecting different land parcels and their proximity to the edge of the settlement. Respective scores of 11, 15 and 16 are achieved with corresponding rankings of low-medium, low-medium and medium-high respectively.

Against the above, Site KEY 10 (Hillside Farm, South Of Bunny Lane) ie SHLAA Site Reference 376 (part of SHLAA Site Reference 434) achieves a "Green Belt Score" of 11 and is considered to be of "low-medium Green Belt importance" in the Draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review, January 2016, as confirmed in paragraph 4.145 on page 94. This assessment and the conclusions stated are endorsed.

In a wider context Site KEY 10 is in a sustainable location on the western edge of Keyworth and is suitable and available for housing. It is both developable and deliverable within the short term offering the prospect of approximately 90 dwellings. It represents an appropriate direction for the growth and expansion of Keyworth, as outlined in the Technical Baseline Document, August 2014 prepared in support of the Draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, which contains clear pointers towards the settlement's (planned) expansion. All the material leads to the conclusion : 'WEST IS BEST', including accessibility to shops and services in the centre and proximity to existing bus routes in Keyworth which, regrettably, have not been fully capitalised upon in the selection and decision making processes.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Radcliffe on Trent

Question 7: *With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:*

	Yes	No
<i>To the east of the village</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>To the south of the village</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>To the west of the village</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 8: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site RAD1 – land north of Nottingham Road (potential capacity around 300 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD2 – land adjacent Grooms Cottage (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD3 – land off Shelford Road (potential capacity around 400 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD4 – land north of Grantham Road to north of railway line (potential capacity around 900 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD5 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1) (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD6 – 72 Main Road (potential capacity around 7 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD7 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (2) (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD8 – land south of Grantham Road (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD9 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (west) (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD10 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (east) (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Ruddington

Question 9: With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:

	Yes	No
To the north of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the north east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the south of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the west of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 10: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site RUD1 – land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD2 – land to the west of Wilford Road (north) (potential capacity around 440 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD3 – land adjacent to St Peter’s Junior School (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD4 – Easthorpe House and adjacent land (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD5 – land south of Flawforth Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD6 – land at Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD7 – land north west of Asher Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD8 – land west of Pasture Lane (potential capacity around 370 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD9 – land south of Landmere Lane (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RUD10 – land adjacent to Landmere Farm (potential capacity around 5 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Any other location (please specify which)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Housing sites within key rural settlements

Question 11: Should any sites within ‘key settlements’ be allocated for development in the LAPP?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for housing development.

Additional land fronting Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave should be allocated for residential development.

SHLAA Site Reference 43 is both suitable and available for housing. It lies within the existing settlement framework and is not in the statutory Green Belt. It would

complement existing housing currently underway in the vicinity at Hollygate Park (former Cotgrave Colliery) with up to 30 additional dwellings and facilitate pedestrian connectivity to/from the centre of the settlement.

In a wider context it could assist in meeting the Borough's approved (minimum) housing requirement, as specified in the Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy), December 2014, and contribute towards the 5 Years Housing Land Supply position across Rushcliffe.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Housing development at 'other villages'

Question 12: Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate any land for housing development at 'other villages' across the Borough?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered NO, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for housing development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 13: *Should we allocate any sites for purely ‘affordable housing’ at ‘other villages’ across the Borough?*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, it would be helpful if you are able to identify which site(s) should be allocated for purely affordable housing development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Accessibility and wheelchair housing standards

Question 14: *Should we introduce policy in the LAPP to require a proportion of new homes to meet the enhanced Building Regulation standards for ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’ and/or ‘wheelchair user dwellings’.*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Question 15: *Should the LAPP allocate any specific sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation?*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, it would be helpful if you are able to identify which site(s) should be allocated.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Custom and self-build housing

Question 16: *How should we specifically meet needs for custom and self-build housing across Rushcliffe?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 17: Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Green Belt

Alterations to existing Green Belt 'inset' boundaries

Question 18: Do you support the alterations recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) to the Green Belt inset boundaries at:

	Yes	No
<i>Cotgrave</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Cropwell Bishop</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>East Bridgford</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Radcliffe on Trent</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>Ruddington</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Tollerton</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Please provide any comments in support of your response.</i>		
<i>(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</i>		

Creation of new Green Belt ‘inset’ boundaries

Question 19: *Do you support the Green Belt inset boundaries recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) for:*

	Yes	No
<i>Bradmore</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Bunny</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Cropwell Butler</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Gotham</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Newton</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Plumtree</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
Shelford	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Saxondale	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide comments to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

‘Safeguarding land’ within the Green Belt

Question 20 Should we designate any further ‘safeguarded land’ within Rushcliffe?

- Yes
- No

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be identified as ‘safeguarded land’.

Site KEY 10 (Hillside Farm, Bunny Lane, Keyworth), as defined in the Draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review, January 2016, should be identified as Whiteland/Safeguarded Land if it is NOT allocated for housing. This particular site (also referenced No. 376 in the SHLAA) has a lower (Green Belt) score than KEY 14 and, in sustainability terms, is closer to the centre of the settlement and its facilities and services than KEY 1 and KEY 14. As such it performs better and represents a more appropriate location to meet development needs in the longer term than the two areas identified in the Draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

Site COT 1 (Land behind Mill Lane/The Old Park, Cotgrave – SHLAA Site Reference 359), as defined in the Draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review, January 2016, should be identified as Whiteland/Safeguarded Land. This particular site achieves a Green Belt score of 9 and is considered to be “of low Green Belt importance.” The site is well contained and, in sustainability terms, is located on the edge of the settlement in close proximity to development currently underway at Hollygate Park (former Cotgrave Colliery). It offers the prospect of meeting development needs in the longer term and accommodating Cotgrave’s future expansion in a comprehensive manner with adjoining land uses.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other matters

Question 21: *Please identify any matters related to Green Belts and Green Belt policy not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Employment Provision and Economic Development

Allocation of land for employment development

Question 22: Should we allocate any new sites for employment development in Rushcliffe?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for employment development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Remaining rural employment land allocations

Question 23: Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 8 to 10) continue to be allocated for employment development?

	Yes	No
Sites at Chapel Lane, Bingham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site at Hathern Works, Sutton Bonnington	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

The existing (remaining) employment allocation at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave, as identified on Figure 9 on page 39, provides a potential (local) source of land for business/employment and should be retained accordingly.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Bunny Brickworks and British Gypsum Works

Question 24: Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 11 and 12) continue to be identified as suitable for employment redevelopment?

	Yes	No
Bunny Brickworks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
British Gypsum Works, Gotham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Langar and Langar Airfield

Question 25: Should the LAPP allow for employment development to take place on the three areas at Langar, as defined on Figure 13?

Yes

No

Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know whether you think the boundaries of the three defined areas are in the right place or whether one or more of them should be altered and, if so, how?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Existing employment sites

Question 26: *Should we continue to protect viable employment sites through the inclusion within the LAPP of a criteria based policy similar to Policy EMP4 of the Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan?*

Yes

No

Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered NO, it would be helpful to identify what alternative approach you think we should take.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Centres of Excellence

Question 27: *Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to the Centres of Excellence?*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already within Core Strategy Policy 5.....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP and whether any land should be allocated to allow for the expansion of any of the sites.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Rural Diversification

Question 28: *Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to rural diversification?*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 5).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other matters

Question 29: Please identify any matters related to economic development and employment land provision not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Regeneration

Question 30: Should the following sites be identified as suitable for regeneration and be allocated as such through the LAPP?

	Yes	No
Bunny Brickworks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Former Islamic Institute, Flintham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At any other location (please specify which)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the design, mix and layout of development and any services and facilities required to support development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other matters

Question 31: Please identify any matters related to regeneration not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Retail Centres

Defining the boundary of centres and primary shopping areas

Question 32: Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages, as defined at Appendix C, for:

	Yes	No
<i>Bingham District Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>West Bridgford District Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Cotgrave Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>East Leake Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth (The Square) Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth (Wolds Drive) Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Radcliffe on Trent Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Ruddington Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide comments to support your answers. If you answered NO for any one of the centres, we would be interested to know what alternations you think should be made.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Non-retail uses in centres

Question 33: *Do you have any comments to make on what the approach should be towards the proportion of A1 (shops) uses and non-A1 uses within the primary shopping areas of District and Local Centres?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Allocation of sites within or on the edge of retail centres

Question 34: *Should we allocate land for new retail or other commercial development in or around any of Rushcliffe's district or local centres, or elsewhere in the Borough?*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know which land should be allocated, what for and why?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Centres of Neighbourhood Importance

Question 35: *Should we designate those 'areas set out at Appendix D as Centres of Neighbourhood Importance (CoNI)? If so, are the boundaries correctly defined?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 36: Are there any other locations that should be defined as CoNIs?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 37: Should a mix of Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 be supported within CoNIs?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Retail development in edge-of centre and out-of-town locations

Question 38: Should we set a local threshold requiring an impact assessment for all retail proposals with a gross floorspace of 500m² or more across the whole of Rushcliffe?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, we would be interested to know what you think the locally set threshold should be.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other matters

Question 39: *Please to identify any matters related to retail centres and retail development not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Design and Landscape Character

General Design

Question 40: *Should the LAPP include more detailed policy in relation to the design of new development*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 10).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Landscape Character

Question 41: *Please make any comments you have about what should be included in the LAPP in respect of the landscape character, including whether there are any areas of locally valued landscape requiring additional protection.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 42: *Please identify any matters related to design and landscape character that are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Historic Environment

Question 43: *Please identify any elements of the historic environment of Rushcliffe Borough that should be specifically identified in the LAPP?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Locally listed assets

Question 44: *Should we identify a local list of heritage assets within Rushcliffe Borough?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 45: *Please make any comments you have about what a local heritage assets policy should include or any other comments you have about the issue of locally listed heritage assets.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Development affecting designated heritage assets

Question 46: *Should we include within the LAPP policies on development affecting designated assets?*

Yes – *policies are required for designated assets*.....

No – *they have sufficient policy protection already (e.g within the NPPF)*.....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please provide information about what such policies should include.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 47: *Please identify any matters related to the Historic Environment which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Climate Change, Flood Risk and Water Use

Renewable and low carbon energy generation

Question 48: *Should we identify areas of the Borough as suitable for renewable and low carbon energy generation?*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Reducing carbon dioxide emissions

Question 49: *Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP on how development should contribute to reducing carbon dioxide emissions?*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Water efficiency standards

Question 50: *Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP to require the lower optional Building Regulations standard of 110 litres per person per day water use.*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Managing flood risk

Question 51: *Please make any comments you have about how we should define areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3 where windfall site development is appropriate in flood risk terms, subject to the application of the exception test.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 52: *Is there a need for any further policy on managing flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems?*

Yes

No

Please provide any information in support of your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question53: *Please identify any matters related to climate change, flood risk and related issues that are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Green infrastructure networks

Question 54: Which types of land use should also be incorporated into the Green Infrastructure network?

	Yes	No
<i>Parks and County Parks</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>School playing fields</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Allotments</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Sports pitches</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Amenity space (e.g. information open space)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Golf courses</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Designated and non-designated nature conservation sites</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Flood alleviation areas</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Other (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 55: *What are your views on the following:*

a) *Where are Rushcliffe's existing local Green Infrastructure corridors and how do they relate to the strategic priorities?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

b) *What evidence exists to support the identification of existing and proposed Green Infrastructure?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

c) *How should new Green Infrastructure corridors be identified? Does Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 3) provide suitable selection criteria?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

d) *Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 2d) refers to 'areas of identified deficit', where are these and how do they relate to the strategic priorities?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

e) *Once an identified network is established, does the Core Strategy provide sufficient policy guidance to ensure multi-functional Green Infrastructure is delivered, protected and enhanced?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

f) *How should the network be recognised within the Local Plan, for example should it be identified within the proposals map and supported by a detailed policy, or within a stand-alone Green Infrastructure Strategy?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Local Green Spaces

Question 56: *Are there any spaces in Rushcliffe that should be designed as a Local Green Space and what should a policy within the LAPP to ensure their protection from development include?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Protection of Parks and open space

Question 57: *Should the LAPP include further policy to protect parks and open space?*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 16).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Open space, sports and recreation standards

Question 58: *Please make any comments you have about what the LAPP should include in respect of open space, sports or recreation space standards.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Biodiversity

Question 59: *In relation to improving the Biodiversity Network, what are your views on the following:*

- a) *Where are Rushcliffe's existing biodiversity networks, what habitats do they consist of and where do opportunities to enhance the network exist?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

- b) *What evidence exists to support the identification of existing and proposed biodiversity networks?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

c) *How should the networks be recognised in the LAPP?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

d) *Does Core Strategy Policy 17 sufficiently protect, restore and expand the biodiversity network without the need for further policy in the LAPP?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 60: *In relation to the protection of designated and non-designated nature conservation interests, what are your views on the following:*

a) *Does Core Strategy Policy 17 sufficiently cover the level of protection necessary for designated and non-designated sites or is further policy required in the LAPP?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

b) *Should the LAPP have a specific policy to protect and enhance ancient woodland and veteran trees and, if so, why?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

c) *Should the LAPP include a policy on biodiversity off-setting, to ensure compensation is delivered and, if so, why?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 61: Please identify any matters related to Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and recreation space which are not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Culture, Tourism and Sports Facilities

Question 62: Should we allocate any new sites for cultural, tourism or sports development in Rushcliffe?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 63: Should the LAPP include further policy to determine proposals for new cultural and sporting facilities and/or to protect existing facilities?

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 13).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Safeguarded recreational facilities

Question 64: Should the LAPP also include policy to safeguard the following locations from development which would prejudice the ecological, recreational, tourism and commercial potential?

	Yes	No
<i>the River Trent</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the River Soar</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the Grantham Canal</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the Great Central Railway</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

If you answered YES in relation to the Grantham Canal, we would be interested to know whether you think a route should also be safeguarded for a new canal link between the existing canal and the River Trent.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 65: *Please identify any matters related to culture, tourism and sports facilities which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Contamination and Pollution

Contamination and land instability

Question 66: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the contamination and land instability.*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Noise pollution

Question 67: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the noise pollution:*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Light pollution

Question 68: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to light pollution:*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Air quality

Question 69: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the air pollution:*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 70: Please identify any matters related to contamination and pollution which are not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Transport

General transport policy

Question 71: Do you agree that no further local transport policy is required in the LAPP?

Yes—additional local policy is not needed.....

No – further local policy is needed (please identify what policy).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, please provide information about what policy is needed.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Highway design and parking standards

Question 72: *Should we (please tick one):*

Continue to use the guidance in the 6Cs Highway Design Guide?

Set out and adopt an approach through the LAPP?.....

Adopt another approach (please set out what)?.....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 73: *Please identify any matters related to transport which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Telecommunication Infrastructure

Question 74: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to telecommunications:*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 75: *Please identify any matters related to telecommunications which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 76: Please identify any topics or issues which you consider need to be covered by the LAPP which are not addressed elsewhere in this document.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Signed:

R. Galij

Date:

24/03/2016

Please return by **5pm on Thursday 24 March 2016** to:

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Civic Centre, Pavilion Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham. NG2 5FE

Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

Data protection: The details you submit to the Borough Council will be used in the Local Plan preparation and associated processes. Please note that comments and personal details cannot be treated as confidential and may be made available for public inspection both physically and/or through the Borough Council's website. We may publish all names, addresses and comments received, including on our website. We will use our best endeavours to not publish signatures, personal telephone numbers or email addresses.

Rushcliffe Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) (Draft for consultation)

Response Form

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI	Name	
Planning Director Barratt Homes North Midlands Division 2 Horizon Place Mellors Way Nottingham Business Park Nottingham NG8 6PY	Address	
robert.galij@barratthomes.co.uk	E-mail	

1. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Proposed insets for washed over villages

Do you consider the methodology for identifying the inset village Green Belt boundaries is appropriate (page 7 of the review)? If you do not, please state how the methodology for new inset boundaries could be improved.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

2. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Proposed insets for washed over villages

Do you agree or disagree with the suggested inset boundaries for the settlements currently washed over? If you disagree, state why the boundary is incorrect and where the new boundary should be. Your comment should focus on the contribution the land makes to the openness of the Green Belt, long term permanence and the presence of recognisable defensible boundaries.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

3. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Minor Amendments to Existing Boundaries

Do you consider the methodology for identifying minor amendments appropriate (pages 19 to 20 of the review)? If you do not, please state how the methodology for minor amendments could be improved.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

4. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Minor Amendments to Existing Boundaries

Do you agree or disagree with the suggested minor amendments to existing settlement boundaries? If you disagree, please identify which minor amendment is incorrect and state why and how the minor amendment should be changed. This should be based on the contribution the land makes to the openness of the Green Belt, long term permanence and the presence of recognisable defensible boundaries.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

5. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Key Settlement Review

Do you consider the methodology for assessing land around Rushcliffe's Key Settlements against the purposes for including land within the Green Belt is appropriate (pages 39 to 44 of the review)? If you do not, please state how the methodology could be improved.

The methodology for assessing Green Belt land around Key Settlements, as contained on pages 39 - 44, is endorsed.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

6. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Key Settlement Review

Do you agree or disagree with the assessment of Green Belt land around Rushcliffe's Key Settlements against the purposes for including land within the Green Belt (pages 44 to 148 of the review)? If you disagree, state why the assessment is incorrect and provide your Green Belt score and conclusions on Green Belt importance. Your comment should focus on the land's performance against Green Belt purposes.

The assessment of Green Belt land around Keyworth is endorsed. A 'two stage' assessment involving: (1) Strategic Review Of Green Belt Importance – Broad Area Level; and (2) Detailed Review Of SHLAA Sites – Individual Land Parcels; is endorsed.

The conclusions reached under Stage (1) for 'Keyworth West' in paragraphs 4.130 – 4.133 with a Score of "14", in terms of Green Belt Purpose, is welcomed. This score is the joint second lowest of the four (broad) strategic areas assessed around Keyworth with an overall conclusion land to the west is of "low-medium Green Belt Value."

Regarding Stage (2), the assessment for and conclusions reached on Green Belt Site Reference KEY 10 (Hillside Farm, Bunny Lane) in paragraphs 4.142 - 4.145 on pages 93 - 94 is particularly welcomed. In achieving a Green Belt Score of "11", when judged against Green Belt Purpose, this represents the joint second lowest number of all the sites assessed around Keyworth. It reflects the overall conclusion this parcel of land is of "low-medium Green Belt Importance."

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

7. Please provide any others comments you wish to make

Clarification is sought over Green Belt Site Reference KEY 10 (Hillside Farm, Bunny Lane, Keyworth), as depicted on pages 70 and 152, and its association with SHLAA Reference 434. Notwithstanding the commentary in paragraph 4.142 on page 93, this parcel of land should be referenced 376 numerically, in line with previous SHLAAs, given it can be considered on its own (planning) merits and is capable of being developed on its own.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Signed:	R. Galij	Date:	24/03/2016
----------------	-----------------	--------------	-------------------

Please return by **5pm on Thursday 24 March 2016** to: Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Civic Centre, Pavilion Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham. NG2 5FE
Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

Data protection: The details you submit to the Borough Council will be used in the Local Plan preparation and associated processes. Please note that comments and personal details cannot be treated as confidential and may be made available for public inspection both physically and/or through the Borough Council's website. We may publish all names, addresses and comments received, including on our website. We will use our best endeavours to not publish signatures, personal telephone numbers or email addresses.